KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321) 1 United States Attorney 2 EUMI L. CHOI (WVSBN 0722) 3 Chief, Criminal Division 4 JEFFREY D. NEDROW (CSBN 161299) Assistant United States Attorney 5 150 Almaden Boulevard, Suite 900 6 San Jose, California 95113 Telephone: (408) 535-5045 orneys for Plaintiff UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT '10JAN 042006 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 11 SAN JOSE DIVISION 12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 13 No. CR 05-70935-PVT 14 Plaintiff. [Proposed] ORDER GRANTING REQUEST TO CONTINUE 15 VS. PRELIMINARY HEARING OR ARRAIGNMENT 16 STEVE HEINZ, 17 Defendant. 18 Upon stipulation of the parties in open court on December 8, 2005, and good cause 19 20 appearing, the Court finds as follows: 1. The United States of America, defendant Steve Heinz and his attorney, Angela 21 Hansen, Esq., requested a continuance of the date set for preliminary hearing or indictment from 22 Thursday, December 8, 2005, to Thursday, February 2, 2006, at 11:00 a.m. 23 2. The parties stipulated that this continuance was necessary to give the parties adequate 24 time to attempt to resolve this matter, for the government to provide discovery, and for the 25 defense to meaningfully review the discovery and make a pre-charge decision regarding a 26 27

28

possible disposition in this matter.

- 3. The defendant was advised in open court, and acknowledged his understanding, that under Rule 5.1(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, he was entitled to a preliminary hearing within 10 days of his initial appearance unless an indictment is filed beforehand, and pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b) he was entitled to be indicted within 30 days of his arrest in this matter. After consultation with his attorney, the defendant stated that he wished to waive those rights and continue the hearing set for preliminary hearing or indictment until February 2, 2006. The Court found that the defendant had provided a knowing and intelligent waiver of his rights as set forth above.
- 4. The court finds and the parties agreed that the ends of justice served by this continuance outweigh the interests of the defendant and the public in a speedy indictment and trial inasmuch as additional time was needed for the government to provide the defense with discovery, for the defendant to meaningfully review that discovery, and for the parties to fairly evaluate the possibility of a pre-charge resolution in this matter. Failure to grant the requested continuance would deny counsel for both parties the reasonable time necessary to for effective preparation regarding these decisions taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
- 5. Finally, the Court finds good cause to extend the time limits under Rule 5.1(c) pursuant to Rule 5.1(d). Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the date set for preliminary hearing or indictment is continued from Thursday, December 8, 2005, to Thursday, February 2, 2006.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the period of time from December 8, 2005 through and including February 2, 2006 shall be excluded from the time within which an indictment must be filed, for the reasons set forth above, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161 (h)((8)(A) considering the factors set forth in § 3161(h)(8)(B)(i) and (iv).

Dated this <u>4</u> day of January, 2006.

PATRICIA V. TRUMBULL United States Magistrate Judge